

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-10 and 12-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 10, 12 and 16-22 stand rejected. Claim 3-9 and 13-15 were previously withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 10, 16-18 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sukegawa et al.** (US 2003/0039380, previously cited) in view of **Iisaka et al.** (USP 6,366,221, previously cited). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sukegawa et al.** in view of **Iisaka et al.** in further in view of **Hoshuyama et al.** (USP 6,906,744, previously cited). Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sukegawa et al.** in view of **Iisaka et al.** in further in view of **Shimazaki et al.** (US 2002/0198634, previously cited).

Initially, it is noted that independent claims 1 and 20-22 have been amended to clarify aspects of the present invention.

As will be discussed in more detail below, it is respectfully submitted that the curved lines in Figs. 5A, 5B and 6 of **Iisaka** merely indicate movement units in the display image and the curved lines are not “the lines included in the line pattern possessed by the *physical* object [as a *shooting target*]” as recited in claim 1 (and similarly in claims 20-22).

More particularly, regarding claim 1, the Examiner recognizes that **Sukegawa et al.** fails

to disclose “the object possesses a line pattern including lines; a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting unit is defined as the expected shooting state information; and said guide determining unit determines that the object is not required to be guided...”. The Examiner relies on **Iisaka** to teach these features (see final Office Action, page 5, lines 2-17).

However, it is respectfully submitted that **Iisaka** does not disclose or suggest at least the following features presently recited in claim 1, “the *physical* object [as a shooting target] possesses a line pattern including lines; a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting unit is defined as the expected shooting state information; and said guide determining unit determines that the *physical* object is not required to be guided, if the number of the lines included in the line pattern *possessed by the physical object* or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern *possessed by the physical object*, which is detected from an image of the *physical* object shot by said shooting unit, is larger than the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the expected shooting state information.”

More specifically, **Iisaka et al.** relates to a driver assistance system for generating a display image that is helpful for assisting a driver of a vehicle when parking in a parking space. In operation of the **Iisaka et al.** system, a camera 2 captures a frame of an image around a rear of the vehicle (col. 3, lines 37-47). However, **Iisaka** does not disclose or suggest that the physical object captured by the cameras 2 possesses a line pattern including lines. That is, Iisaka does not disclose the claimed “the physical object [as a shooting target] possesses a line pattern including lines”. Further, **Iisaka** does not disclose or suggest that it is determined whether an object is not required to be guided based on the number of lines or the total length of lines included in a line

pattern of a physical object shot by the cameras 2. That is, **Iisaka** does not disclose “said guide determining unit determines that the physical object is not required to be guided if the number of the lines included in the line pattern possessed by the physical object or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern possessed by the physical object...”).

Unlike the claimed invention, the curved lines depicted in FIGS. 5A, 5B and 6 of **Iisaka** merely indicate movement units in the display image (i.e., a predetermined quantity by which the vehicle model is moved in the display image (see col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 5)), and the curved lines are **not** included in a line pattern possessed by the physical object. Hence, the movement quantity of the vehicle model of **Iisaka** has no relation to “the number of lines included in the line pattern possessed by the physical object or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern possessed by the physical object” presently recited in claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither **Sukegawa** nor **Iisaka**, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests at least the following features of presently amended claim 1:

“the *physical object [as a shooting target]* possesses a *line pattern* including lines; a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting unit is defined as the expected shooting state information; and said guide determining unit determines that the physical object is not required to be guided, if the number of the lines included in the *line pattern possessed by the physical object* or the total length of the lines included in the *line pattern possessed by the physical object*, which is detected from the image of the physical object shot by

said shooting unit, is larger than the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the expected shooting state information.” [Emphasis added.]

Further, it is respectfully submitted that neither **Sukegawa** nor **Iisaka** disclose or suggest at least the following features recited in claim 20 (and similarly in claim 21):

“shooting the physical object as a shooting target with the shooting device, the physical object possessing a line pattern including lines, and a position of the physical object being movable” and “wherein the expected shooting state information is defined as a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting device, and said determining further comprises determining that the physical object is not required to be guided if the number of the lines included in the line pattern possessed by the physical object or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern possessed by the physical object, which is detected from an image of the physical object shot by said shooting device, is larger than the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the expected shooting state information.”

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that neither **Sukegawa** nor **Iisaka** disclose or suggest at least the following features recited in claim 22:

“the physical object [as a shooting target] possesses a line pattern including lines; a number of lines or a total length of lines to be shot by said shooting means is defined as the expected shooting state information; and said guide determining means determines that the physical object is not required to be guided, if the number of the lines included in the line pattern possessed by the physical object or the total length of the lines included in the line pattern possessed by the physical object, which is detected from the image of the physical object shot by

said shooting means, is larger than the number of lines or the total length of lines, which is defined as the expected shooting state information.”

A rejection under §103 requires that the combination of reference teachings applied against the claims must disclose, or at least suggest, all claimed elements. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of **Sukegawa** and **Iisaka** does not disclose or suggest all elements recited in independent claims 1 and 20-22. Therefore, it is submitted that independent claims 1 and 20-22, and claims dependent therefrom, are not obvious in view of the combination of **Sukegawa** and **Iisaka**. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 10, 16-18 and 20-22 under §103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Application No. 10/784,776
Art Unit 2622

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.114
Attorney Docket No. 042090

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/WILLIAM M. SCHERTLER/

William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,348
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/kr